1			
1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
2	FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA		
3	MICHAEL S. ARGENYI,)		
4	Plaintiff,) 8:09CV341		
5	vs.) Omaha, Nebraska) August 20, 2013		
6	CREIGHTON UNIVERSITY,)		
7	Defendant.)		
8			
9			
10	VOLUME I TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS		
11	BEFORE THE HONORABLE LAURIE SMITH CAMP CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE AND A JURY		
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20	COURT REPORTER: Ms. Brenda L. Fauber, RDR, CRR 111 S. 18th Plaza		
21	Suite 3122 Omaha, NE 68102		
22	(402) 661-7322		
23			
24	Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript		
25	produced with computer.		

•		
1		A-P-P-E-A-R-A-N-C-E-S
2		
3	FOR THE PLAINTIFF:	Ms. Mary C. Vargas Mr. Michael S. Stein
4		Stein Vargas Law Firm P.O. Box 522
5		Emmitsburg, MD 21727
6		Ms. Dianne D. DeLair
		Nebraska Advocacy Services
7		134 South 13th Street Suite 600
8		Lincoln, NE 68508
9		Ms. Caroline E. Jackson
10		NAD and Advocacy Center 8630 Fenton Street
11		Suite 820
12		Silver Springs, MD 20910
13	FOR THE DEFENDANT:	Mr. Scott P. Moore
14		Ms. Allison D. Balus Baird Holm Law Firm
15		1700 Farnam Street Suite 1500
		Omaha, NE 68102
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
20		

```
1
            (At 8:35 a.m. on August 20, 2013, with counsel for the
 2
       parties present in chambers, the following proceedings were
 3
       had:)
                THE COURT: Well, there have been a few more motions
 5
       filed since five o'clock last night, and I can't say that I've
 6
       had a chance to digest them all. You've submitted
 7
       stipulations at filing 353, and so I accept your stipulations.
            There is a motion for clarification at filing 349. And I
 8
       understand that that is just a request that the order in
10
       limine regarding reference to pretrial matters and precluding
       the plaintiff from referring to pretrial matters will also
11
       apply to the defendant and the defendant's reference to
12
       pretrial matters. And that seems fair and reasonable.
13
14
                MR. MOORE: Yes, your Honor.
15
                THE COURT: And there's no objection to that?
16
                MR. MOORE: No.
17
                THE COURT: So plaintiff's motion for clarification
18
       at filing 349 is granted.
            (Phone rings.)
19
20
                THE COURT: Excuse me, I have to put that on Do Not
21
       Disturb. And Janet has caught it, but I will put it on Do Not
22
       Disturb.
23
            So that leaves us then with a motion for reconsideration
       regarding Creighton's undue burden defense as it relates to
24
25
       interpreters during the plaintiff's M1 and M2 years. And this
```

motion appears at filing 352.

And of course, the plaintiff is making a distinction between use of interpreters and use of CART services. And the plaintiff appears to acknowledge that the defendant is asserting and has asserted in the past the undue burden defense with respect to the CART services used by the plaintiff in M1 and M2.

And as I read this motion, the plaintiff wants the defendant precluded from asserting an undue burden defense with respect to interpreters in the clinical setting.

Plaintiff's counsel is shaking her head. And again we're referring to filing 352. And I will ask counsel for the plaintiff then to clarify for me.

MS. VARGAS: I'm sorry, your Honor.

That motion actually deals with the assertion of undue burden with respect to qualified interpreters for M1 and M2 for the reason that the defendant has argued in their brief that they will not be asserting undue burden with respect to interpreters for M1 and M2.

THE COURT: And what distinction are you drawing between interpreters and CART services? With respect to interpreters, are you talking about interpreters using the cued speech to assist the plaintiff in lip-reading during lectures during M1 and M2?

MS. VARGAS: Defendant has asserted and maintained

1 that it will not argue the affirmative defense of undue burden 2 with respect to what it calls qualified interpreters. I 3 certainly understood that to mean oral sign-supported interpreters. There aren't any cued speech interpreters in 5 Nebraska. THE COURT: Okay. And you may need to clarify the 6 7 difference between the cued speech interpreters and the oral sign-supported interpreters because I understand both of those 8 are different from American Sign Language interpreters. 10 MS. VARGAS: That's right. THE COURT: Okay. I'm learning something here all 11 the time. 12 13 And Mr. Moore, do you want to explain just what the 14 defendant's assertion is regarding undue burden --15 MR. MOORE: Sure. 16 THE COURT: -- in M1 and M2 years. 17 MR. MOORE: Sure. Well, with regard to those areas 18 in which, for M2, Creighton University offered interpreters in the lecture setting, a didactic lecture setting, that alone 19 20 we've alleged does not create an undue burden on Creighton. Indeed Creighton offered those after it received 21 Dr. Thedinger's letter saying the FM system was ineffective. 22 23 However, I don't think the defendant is taking the position that, number one, that what Mr. Argenyi requested in 24 25 total for M1 and M2, which would be interpreters not only in

that setting but in clinics and in labs and in those other areas, if you look at that as a whole, Creighton believes it can still assert and will still assert the undue burden defense. Overall I think it's fair for the jury to hear if Creighton University granted Mr. Argenyi the requests that he wanted, the specific requests that he wanted, over a four-year period, how much that would be as compared to the benefit that he's getting.

So, yes, we do intend to make arguments to the jury that talks about how much the cost would be if we granted the specific requests that he had because from Creighton's perspective, we understood that either he got all of those or it was insufficient. So we believe that's relevant and the jury should hear that on the undue burden.

THE COURT: Does that explanation assist the plaintiff, or does the plaintiff still contend that the defendant is now raising a defense that was earlier waived?

MS. VARGAS: Our concern was that it appeared in the order that the defendant would be allowed to assert undue burden with respect to the provision of qualified interpreters.

And in response to discovery and in briefing, the defendant conceded that it was not an undue burden to provide qualified interpreters. That was never supplemented, so there was no reason to conduct further discovery on that.

That they're asserting undue burden with respect to CART

I think is a separate issue. We're just in this motion

addressing the fact that the defendant has waived and conceded

and stated that it will not assert undue burden with respect

to the provision of qualified interpreters.

THE COURT: So Mr. Moore's explanation alleviates your concern.

MS. VARGAS: Provided he doesn't actually assert that argument. We've had an issue ongoing with this litigation with arguments such as issues related to direct threat and interpreters inhibiting patient care that have been waived and then come back up, and we do not want that to happen with the jury.

THE COURT: Okay. I appreciate the communication between counsel. I don't think that there is a conflict in your actual positions.

And so, what I am going to do is deny filing number -the motion at filing number 352 without prejudice. And if it
appears that the undue burden defense is being raised in a
manner that is inconsistent with Creighton's earlier
representations and waivers, then you can certainly bring that
matter to my attention and we'll address it at that time.

MS. VARGAS: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: I think that that takes care of the currently pending motions as of 8:45.

MR. MOORE: Don't hold your breath.

THE COURT: Let me just talk a little bit about how things are likely to proceed.

And again, I apologize for the fact that we need to interrupt these proceedings tomorrow for this patent hearing. That matter was scheduled many, many months ago, and apparently was the only date that the lawyers, who are coming in from all across the country, could all come in. So the courtroom deputy had locked that in and promised them that date.

Then of course, when this matter came back from the Eighth Circuit, we wanted to give it priority as well to bring it to trial because as you know, the case has been pending for about three years now, since -- is it Mr. Ar-gen-yee?

MS. VARGAS: Ar-gen-ee.

THE COURT: -- since Mr. Argenyi brought the action.

And we don't want him to have to wait any longer than

necessary to get the issues resolved.

So we set it at the earliest possible time. And we will select the jury this morning. I understand that 21 jurors have arrived. One juror had a situation where his wife was in an automobile accident, and so he's on his way to the hospital, and he's been excused.

And whenever we have an odd number of jurors, you get an even number of strikes, both sides get the same number, and

then I take off whoever is remaining at the bottom of the list. So, I take the last strike, but I exercise no discretion in taking that last strike.

We will plan to have a jury of 12. But if for some reason someone gets sick or unable to come, then we'll proceed with the number that we have available.

As you know, I do generally the bulk of the voir dire.

And usually we allocate 10 minutes per side for voir dire, 20 minutes per side for opening statement, and 30 minutes per side for closing argument.

But those time limitations are flexible. And if you believe in this case that you require more time than that, let me know, and this is the point where we negotiate this.

Sometimes lawyers come in from California or New York, and they think they're going to spend days in voir dire. And we just don't do that here. That's not the way we do business. So we're just trying to get a fair jury. We're not trying to ensure that anybody wins or loses the case in voir dire.

So I will ask the plaintiff, first, if those time limits are adequate or if you believe that you need a little bit more in any one of those three areas.

MS. VARGAS: I certainly think the time is adequate, your Honor, for the voir dire. We think that the 20 and 30 minutes are also probably sufficient for opening and closing.

THE COURT: Okay. Very good.

And the defense?

MR. MOORE: I wouldn't mind five more minutes for voir dire. I think the opening and closing I'm absolutely fine with those. I think there are -- this will be the first time the jury hears this, and there's some -- as we discussed this morning, there are some complex issues as to what's going on as far as the different types of speech and those kind of things.

And there's a broad base of folks who could have been impacted by something like that; moreover with the article that appeared in the <u>World-Herald</u>, I want to be sure we understand who saw what and who read what. I'd request five more minutes, 15 minutes for voir dire.

THE COURT: That's fine. Both sides get 15 minutes for voir dire.

The courtroom deputy will help you with the use of lights. We have lights out there like we have at the Nebraska Supreme Court or Nebraska Court of Appeals. So the light's green when you have time to talk; and it's red when your time is up.

And then it's up to you how you want the yellow light to come on for a warning. If you want a five-minute warning or two-minute warning, just let the courtroom deputy know, and she should set that up for you.

And they'll be set up on the bench. Oftentimes we have them at the podium, but you may not want to use a podium, so we'll have them where they're visible to everybody at the bench.

MR. MOORE: So I understand, are we at table during voir dire or...

THE COURT: You can be where you want to be.

MR. MOORE: Okay.

THE COURT: And that's a good thing to discuss at this juncture because I want to make sure that everybody has a fair opportunity to be heard and that nobody gets blocked by a podium. We are not too formal about standing up whenever you speak. We just want to make sure that you are heard and that you can communicate in the courtroom.

So if you stay by a microphone at all times, that's the most important thing, especially since we are having not only the real time, but the CART services provided to the plaintiff and to counsel. We need to make sure that the court reporters can hear everything that's being said; and that the jury, of course, hears everything.

MR. MOORE: Were I to leave counsel table, which I would prefer to do at least for opening and closing, normally I would stand -- the jury's here, I would stand by the table there. I'm not sure how I can be picked up by a microphone.

Normally if someone is standing at the podium, the microphone

```
1
       is in front of them.
 2
                THE COURT: Show me where you're --
 3
                MR. MOORE: The jury box is here and here's our
       table. Normally I would stand right there and put my notes on
 4
 5
       that table.
 6
                THE COURT: So the bench is up here and that's where
 7
       you want to be?
                MR. MOORE: So I'm -- I would like to be able to do
 8
       that and I'm trying to figure out how to be close to a
 9
       microphone.
10
11
                THE COURT: As long as you're not moving around --
                MR. MOORE: Okay.
12
13
                THE COURT: -- we can turn that mike toward you and
14
       that ought to be able to pick up the sound fine. And Brenda
15
       is nodding.
16
                MR. MOORE: Very good.
17
                THE COURT: Sometimes we have lawyers who like to
18
       wander.
19
                MR. MOORE: Yes, right.
20
                THE COURT: Then the sound comes in and out and
       that's what we want to avoid.
21
22
                MR. MOORE: Fortunately I talk with my hands so I
23
       can't move at the same time. So we should be okay with that.
                THE COURT: We've had some lavaliere mikes or lapel
24
25
       likes used from time to time, but I think that this is the
```

better option.

MR. MOORE: Very good. Thank you.

THE COURT: There are certain things we try to avoid saying in the courtroom because it leads to redaction issues. And the things you want to try to avoid, which shouldn't be a problem in this case, are Social Security numbers, bank account numbers, exact addresses -- so rather than asking somebody "where do you live," and then they spit out their exact home address, you might say, "what town are you from," or something along those lines -- full names of minor children and birth dates, exact birth dates. And these are for obvious reasons, but things get uploaded onto the Internet, and we just want to protect people's privacy and avoid identity theft.

As far as schedule is concerned, I'll be going down to meet with the jury for orientation at nine o'clock, and then you're free to set up in the courtroom.

Our courtroom deputy this week is Mary Roundtree. And she'll be bringing up the jurors and getting them seated for the voir dire.

We'll try to start that around 9:30. We never go for longer than two hours without a break, so we take a mid-morning break, we take a noon break that will be at least an hour, and a mid-afternoon break. We won't get that far today because we're going to stop after voir dire and

preliminary instructions.

And then we'll start again on Thursday morning at nine o'clock. And we have all day Thursday and all day Friday. We don't have Monday because I do sentencings all day Monday. That's just the way our schedule works. So we'll start again then Tuesday morning at nine o'clock, and proceed until we're finished.

And I understand your estimate was about four days; is that still --

MR. MOORE: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. And in the voir dire, one thing I go through is the list of witnesses who may be called. And I plan to go through all the names that you've listed for me.

If you know that somebody is not going to be called, you're welcome to tell me. But otherwise I'll read all the names and inquire if anyone knows anyone.

Brenda and Rachel, anything I'm forgetting to cover?

LAW CLERK: Not that I can think of.

MS. VARGAS: I do have a few questions.

First of all, with respect to one of the jurors in the pool, there is a Creighton University pharmacology professor who is among the jury pool. And I just wanted to ask if her time might be more appropriately spent on another jury.

THE COURT: Well, I think --

MS. VARGAS: In deference --

THE COURT: That's probably right. But -- and this was brought to my attention, too. But I don't like to interject myself early on in the jury selection process by saying oh, let's boot this person, this person's obviously going to be conflicted out.

I think it's a better practice in the interests of justice to have the people appear and explain their potential conflict. And then if there's a request by counsel that the person be excused for cause, then I'll excuse them. And you don't have to waste a peremptory strike.

MS. VARGAS: Your Honor, I'm actually more concerned about the potential for tainting the jury pool, given the degree of connection, that it's a pharmacology professor for the defendant, and the defendant's being sued with respect to a professor's -- well, professors will be testifying. And my concern is what she might say to other jurors or in the presence of other jurors that would really taint the rest of the pool to no huge benefit.

THE COURT: All right. So you're moving at this point in time to strike this juror for cause?

MS. VARGAS: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MR. MOORE: I would say yes, your Honor. I don't think we've had an opportunity to talk with her. And I think we have to understand that she can't be a fair and impartial

juror.

I think there's some risk on our side. She's an employee of the pharmacy school. There's some risk on our side that she may not like Creighton, I don't know. But I think in the interests of justice that we should at least have the opportunity to talk to her.

THE COURT: And that's the standard process that we use. I've never -- I can't remember ever striking a juror from the pool before we went into the voir dire process.

What I will do is downstairs in the orientation that I give, I will caution the jurors at that point in time not to discuss anything among themselves about the case or about their own employment or personal lives so that we limit any potential discussion among the jurors.

And then certainly during the voir dire process, if you want to inquire about whether anybody has talked to this juror before the trial has begun, you can inquire about that.

We've had people who have ended up on juries that I never thought would end up on juries because nobody has either asked to strike them for cause or nobody has exercised a peremptory strike, and they've ended up being fair jurors.

So I don't want to jump the gun on this. But, that much I will do during the orientation. I'll caution the jurors not to visit with each other either about the case or about their own backgrounds.

And you have some other things?

MS. VARGAS: I'm sorry, I'm from Maryland, so forgive me for not knowing the process as well for jury selection.

Would you be able to help me understand a little bit more about how you'll be conducting voir dire and how you'd like us to handle follow-up questions we have -- and at some point you'd like us to raise our objections -- so that we don't interrupt your questioning, but we ask at an appropriate time.

THE COURT: Well, when I -- sometimes it's obvious during my portion of the voir dire that someone is not going to be able to be a fair and impartial juror. And at that juncture, generally what I've done is I've looked to counsel and I've said, "Is there a request to excuse this juror for cause," so that I'm not booting them.

And if for any reason you feel that you don't want to move to strike a juror for cause in front of the jury, but you want to do it more discreetly, then we can have a sidebar.

You can just say, "I'd request a sidebar, your Honor," and we'll do a sidebar. And then you can say, "Yes, I'd please like to strike this juror for cause." And that way you don't have to be concerned that anybody on the jury is going to think that you're mean by striking the person.

MS. VARGAS: Thank you.

THE COURT: And at any time if you want to be heard, it's not going to offend me if I'm in the voir dire process

and you stand, I'll recognize you, and at that time you can either make your motion or request a sidebar.

And then you'll also have plenty of opportunity during your own voir dire. You can follow up with additional questions and then you can make your motion or request a sidebar.

MS. VARGAS: To make sure I understand, during the attorney voir dire, would you like us to make our -- any motions we might have during our time or save them for the end of our time? How would you like us to handle that?

THE COURT: Generally the lawyers make their motions during the voir dire as it becomes apparent that somebody is not going to be fair and impartial. And then they'll just turn to me and say, "Your Honor, I would request that this juror be excused from serving on this panel."

And I might follow up with a few more questions if I think it's possible that the juror could be fair and impartial, but oftentimes I agree. But I'm not usually the one who says, you know, "You can leave." I usually defer to the lawyers and get a request from one or both of the lawyers to excuse the juror.

MS. VARGAS: Thank you.

I think the other question I had, are there any limits that your Honor would set on what counsel can say about the case in terms of not giving opening statements during attorney

voir dire? 1 2 THE COURT: And that's always an issue. Some 3 people -- I was a lawyer, too. Sometimes I would use voir dire as an opportunity to plant the seeds about what my case 5 was about and try to persuade people that I had a good case. Yeah, if there's -- if you start making opening statement 6 7 during the voir dire, and there's an objection, I'm likely to sustain the objection. 8 And one clue is when, instead of asking a question of the jury panel, a lawyer begins a narrative. And that's when we 10 usually see the objection. And then I may say, "Sustained. 11 Counsel, please ask a question of the jury." 12 13 MS. VARGAS: Thank you. 14 MS. DeLAIR: I just have one question, your Honor. 15 And I'm not sure if this is the appropriate time, but 16 plaintiff would like to make a motion so that the witnesses 17 are sequestered during the trial. 18 THE COURT: This is a good time to do that and I usually try to remember to ask about that. And I assume 19 20 that's reciprocal? 21 MR. MOORE: We would make the same motion, all witnesses, including the expert witnesses, be sequestered. 22

THE COURT: All witnesses will be sequestered. We will -- it will be reciprocal. We will post a sign on the door. And I ask counsel to help me to enforce that by warning

23

24

25

1 their witnesses not to come in until it's their time to 2 testify. 3 And if you see somebody coming in who shouldn't come in, please bring that to my attention because I don't know what 4 5 your witnesses look like. 6 Anything else? 7 MS. DeLAIR: One more question, your Honor, about possibly preadmitting the exhibits that both parties have 8 9 stipulated to. 10 THE COURT: Sometimes this is done at the pretrial conference, but it was not done here. 11 Let's take a moment to do that. I'd be happy to do that. 12 13 MR. MOORE: Yes, just a second. 14 THE COURT: I'm looking at the joint trial exhibit list, filing 286. And is this the most recent one? 15 16 MR. MOORE: I believe so, your Honor. I don't have the filing number in front of me. 17 18 LAW CLERK: It's the one both parties submitted with their exhibit binders, so -- unless that's changed. 19 MR. MOORE: That should be correct. 20 21 THE COURT: Very good. 22 So you're asking me to go ahead and receive into evidence 23 the exhibits that are marked as offered but where there is no objection noted. Is that fair? 24 25 MS. VARGAS: Your Honor, there are four exhibits, I

```
1
       believe they're number 16 through 19 that were covered already
 2
       by your Honor's ruling on the stipulations. Those are the
 3
       letters from Dr. Backous and Stacy Watson to the defendant.
       And we were able to agree among ourselves that we would not
 5
       have any objection to those documents being admitted, and they
       were part of the stipulations.
 6
 7
                MR. MOORE: That's 16 through 19; yes, we agree, your
 8
       Honor.
                THE COURT: All right. 16 through 19 are received.
                MR. MOORE: From defendant's point of view, there's
10
       several exhibits that there are no objections noted to on the
11
       trial exhibit list that we'd like to -- we can just offer them
12
13
       at this time. And that would be 1, 2 -- I'm sorry, 1 through
14
       9, 11 through 13, 20, 34 and 35, 203, and 213.
15
                MS. VARGAS: Your Honor, I apologize. I don't
16
       actually have that exhibit list in here with me. Is it
       possible that we could address this Thursday morning before
17
18
       opening statements?
                THE COURT: That's fine with me.
19
20
                MR. MOORE: If we could deal with it now, I'd rather,
       as we prepare for the first day and opening.
21
                                                     That will help
       quide us with regard to what we can say in opening. I don't
22
23
       want to make any promises to the jurors that...
                THE COURT: I'll tell you what, this will be easy.
24
25
       What we're going to do is I'm going to make you a copy of
```

```
1
       mine.
 2
            (Off-the-record discussion had.)
 3
                THE COURT: Just to review, the defendant is offering
       first Exhibits 1 through 9. Any objection?
 4
 5
                MS. VARGAS: We have no objection, your Honor.
                THE COURT: Exhibits 1 through 9 are received.
 6
 7
            Defense is offering 11 through 13. Any objection?
                MS. VARGAS: No objection, your Honor.
 8
                THE COURT: 11 through 13 are received.
            Exhibit 20.
10
                MS. VARGAS: We have no objection, your Honor.
11
                THE COURT: Exhibit 20 is received.
12
            Exhibits 34 and 35.
13
14
                MS. VARGAS: We have no objection.
15
                THE COURT: 34 and 35 are received.
16
            Exhibit 203.
17
                MS. VARGAS: No objection.
                THE COURT: 203 is received.
18
            And Exhibit 213.
19
20
                MS. VARGAS: No objection.
                THE COURT: Exhibit 213 is received.
21
22
            Does the plaintiff wish to offer any exhibits into
23
       evidence at this time that you think the defense has no
       objection to?
24
25
                MS. VARGAS: Not at this time, your Honor.
```

1 you. 2 THE COURT: Very good. 3 Anything further? MR. MOORE: A couple questions, your Honor. And 5 again this is in preparing for Thursday. If the plaintiff 6 calls one of our witnesses whom we've listed in their case in 7 chief, can we get them done when they're on the stand rather than having to have them come back? 8 THE COURT: Generally counsel cooperate on this issue for the convenience of the witnesses. And I have to leave it 10 to you to cooperate though with each other. If counsel don't 11 cooperate, you have to call the witness back. Otherwise you 12 13 can't go outside the scope of the direct examination. 14 MR. MOORE: Can we get them done when you call them, 15 so we don't have to call them back next week? 16 MS. VARGAS: I guess this raises another question for 17 us in terms of what your Honor would like us to do with 18 respect to rebuttal. In this case, the issue of undue burden is an affirmative 19 20 defense, and so this hinges in some part on how we handle that 21 issue. We would not be intending to put on a defense to something that they've not yet offered in our case in chief. 22 23 So would we be permitted and should we expect that we can -- if that defense is asserted, and once we understand the 24

boundaries of that defense, then be permitted to have rebuttal

25

on those issues?

And it raises the concerns, it may be some of our own witnesses who might need to come back to the stand.

THE COURT: Well, I'll try to address that in this way, and I'm not sure if it will answer your question.

If you call a witness, whether it's one of the defendant's witnesses or not, and you agree that counsel can go outside the scope of direct on the cross-examination to try to avoid having to bring the witness back again in connection with the defendant's case, then you, of course, would have your redirect and cross. And then counsel for the defense would have an opportunity to do what effectively is redirect.

Generally -- I'll mention this too because this may be a little different from what you do back east -- we don't generally allow recross. So it's -- as a general rule. And this is actually in our local rules. You have your direct, you have your cross, you have your redirect, and that's it.

But, if you come to an agreement that you can go outside the scope of direct examination on the cross, that's effectively your direct as well, and then you have that one extra turn.

And then I can instruct the jury regarding affirmative defenses and what they can consider the evidence for and what they can't consider the evidence for.

I guess that's really the only answer I have for you at

this point in time.

MR. MOORE: Can I ask Mary, are you concerned that for lack of a better term, somehow we'd sandbag and something would come up in the case and you wouldn't have the opportunity to examine them again in a --

MS. VARGAS: That's not so much my concern, Scott.

My concern is more that it really blurs the burdens. The

burden of proof is on a different party with respect to the

case in chief versus the affirmative defense.

So we would not be inclined to allow on cross going outside the scope of direct. But we understand that you obviously have a right to assert and put on your case with respect to the parts of the case that you bear the burden on, so undue burden.

There's also an issue that the defenses have changed rather significantly on a month-to-month basis. And so for us to preemptively guess what the defenses might be and what the bounds of those defenses are would prejudice us.

So we'd rather that we put on our case, you put on your case; and then to the extent you've asserted an affirmative defense, we have an opportunity to rebut that.

THE COURT: And all I can tell you is I have to leave this in the hands of counsel. And if you can work something out, that's fine. If you can't, then the defense will need to call its witnesses when it's the defendant's turn.

1 MS. VARGAS: Then if we had a witness in our case in 2 chief, would we be permitted to recall that person in rebuttal 3 if they needed to address something that was raised for the first time as an affirmative defense? 5 THE COURT: Sure. 6 MR. MOORE: Just so I understand, we've got to call 7 our witnesses twice because -- this is going to be really tough. We've got -- you subpoenaed everybody on our side 8 pretty much for both Thursday and Friday. And they're going to all show up then. And you'll make them all come back next 10 week because this is really --11 MS. DeLAIR: Can I -- it's my understanding, 12 13 according to the rules, that we submit a list of who we 14 believe will be testifying and we do that a day before, so I 15 think that might alleviate some of your concerns, Scott. 16 MR. MOORE: Okay. I want to talk more about that, but I understand, your Honor. 17 18 THE COURT: I want the lawyers to talk about that among themselves. If there's anything else you need me for, 19 20 I'll answer your other questions if I can. Then I need to get 21 down to meet with the jury. MS. VARGAS: I do have -- I'm very sorry. In terms 22 23 of the jury, will we know what order they're being seated in? THE COURT: You will have a seating chart that will 24 25 lay out for you their names with stickers. And if for some

1 reason we need to replace, like excuse a juror -- we're not 2 going to have to replace any other juror. We have to do that 3 in criminal cases because we have a bigger pool. But here we're going to have everybody seated, and 5 everybody will be stickered on your chart. And you will be 6 able to see exactly where they're seated, what their name is, 7 whether they're married or single, how many kids they have, and where they work. It will all be on that sticker. 8 And I'm not good with names and faces, so I have to rely on the stickered chart. So that will be available to you. 10 MS. VARGAS: My question is more about how we know 11 which are the 12 that are first up in the box. And then do we 12 13 know which order they're replaced in? 14 MR. MOORE: They'll all be in the box at one time. 15 MS. BALUS: They're all seated in the box. 16 MS. VARGAS: But all 21 won't be sitting for the case. So how will we know --17 18 MS. BALUS: From the end into the box. There's like chairs in front of the box; if we strike those people, even if 19 20 they're still sitting there, they won't... THE COURT: We're going to start off with 21. 21 They're all going to be over there in the box area. Some of 22 23 them will sit in front of the box. You'll have your chart showing where they're all seated. 24

And then if somebody is excused for cause, they'll leave.

25

When nobody else has been excused for cause, then Mary
Roundtree, the courtroom deputy, will go back and forth for
you to exercise your peremptory challenges. You'll get an
even number of peremptory challenges. And if there's an
odd -- if there are 13 jurors left, I will strike the last
one, based upon the numerical list; just take the one off the
bottom. And I think it will all become very clear when you go
out there.

MS. VARGAS: Let's say after the issues with cause are addressed and the peremptory challenges are handled, if there are, say, 15 jurors remaining, how does that...

THE COURT: I'm going to let you exercise as many peremptory challenges as are needed to get it down to 12 or 13.

MS. VARGAS: Okay.

THE COURT: Usually we try not to call more jurors than we really need. So usually I think the rule is you get three strikes per side.

But, you can exercise the number of strikes necessary to get it down to 12 or 13. If it's 13, I just take off the last one.

MS. VARGAS: So there will not be an alternate, there will be 12.

THE COURT: There will be no alternate. We have the alternate in the criminal cases but not the civil cases

1 because if we lose one, we lose one. It doesn't matter. 2 MS. VARGAS: Thank you very much. THE COURT: I will see you in the courtroom. 3 (Concluded in chambers at 9:25 a.m.) 5 (Jury selected and sworn.) 6 THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, I am 7 now going to be giving you some instructions about this case and about your duties as jurors. At the end of the trial I'll 8 give you more instructions. I may give you some instructions during the trial. All instructions, those I give you now and 10 those I give you later, whether they are in writing or given 11 to you orally, are equally important and you must follow them 12 13 all. 14 As I mentioned earlier, this is a civil case brought by 15 the plaintiff, Michael Argenyi, against the defendant, 16 Creighton University. 17 The defendant is a place of public accommodation for 18 purposes of Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act which we also refer to as the ADA. And Creighton is a 19 20 recipient of federal financial assistance for purposes of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 that I will 21 refer to as the Rehabilitation Act. 22 23 The plaintiff has a disability as the term is defined by the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Rehabilitation 24 25 Act.

The plaintiff was admitted to the defendant's medical school and alleges that the defendant violated his rights under the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Rehabilitation Act by failing to provide him with accommodations and auxiliary aids and services he claims were necessary to ensure effective communication.

The plaintiff also alleges that the defendant acted with deliberate indifference when it denied him the auxiliary aids and services he requested.

Creighton University denies Mr. Argenyi's allegations and asserts that it provided him reasonable and necessary accommodations and auxiliary aids and services and did not discriminate against him in any way. The defendant asserts as its affirmative defense that providing the plaintiff with the auxiliary aids and services he requested would have posed an undue burden on it.

It will be your duty to decide from the evidence which party is entitled to your verdict. Your verdict -- excuse me. Your duty is to decide what the facts are from the evidence. You are allowed to consider the evidence in light of your own observations and experiences.

After you have decided what the facts are, you will have to apply those facts to the law which I give you in these and in my other instructions. That is how you will reach your verdict.

Only you will decide what the facts are. However, you must follow my instructions, whether you agree with them or not. You have taken an oath to follow the law that I give you in my instructions.

In deciding what the facts are, you may have to decide what testimony you believe and what testimony you do not believe. You may believe all of what a witness says or only part of it or none of it.

In deciding what testimony to believe, consider the witness's intelligence, their opportunity to have seen or heard the things they testify about, their memories, any reasons they might have to testify a certain way, how they act while testifying, whether they said something different at another time, whether their testimony is generally reasonable, and how consistent their testimony is with other evidence you believe.

Do not let sympathy or your own likes or dislikes influence you. The law requires you to come to a just verdict based only on the evidence, your common sense, and the law that I gave you in my instructions, and nothing else.

Nothing I say or do during this trial is meant to suggest what I think of the evidence or what I think your verdict should be.

When I use the word evidence, I mean the testimony of witnesses, documents and other things I receive as exhibits,

facts that I tell you the parties have agreed are true, and any other facts that I tell you to accept as true.

Some things are not evidence. I will tell you what is not evidence.

Lawyers' statements, arguments, questions, and comments are not evidence. Documents or other things that might be in court or talked about but that do not -- that I do not receive as exhibits are not evidence.

Objections are not evidence. Lawyers have a right and sometimes a duty to object when they believe something should not be part of the trial. Do not be influenced one way or the other by objections. If I sustain a lawyer's objection to a question or an exhibit, that means the law does not allow you to consider that information. When that happens, you must ignore the question or the exhibit and must not try to guess what the information might have been.

Testimony and exhibits that I strike from the record or tell you to disregard are not evidence, and you must not consider them.

Anything you see or hear about this case outside the courtroom is not evidence and you must not consider it.

Also, I might tell you that you can consider a piece of evidence for one purpose only and not for any other purpose.

If that happens, I will tell you what purpose you can consider the evidence for and what you are not allowed to consider it

for.

You need to pay close attention when I give an instruction about evidence that you can consider for only certain purposes because you might not have that instruction in writing later in the jury room.

Some of you may have heard the terms direct evidence and circumstantial evidence. You should not be concerned with those terms because the law makes no distinction between the weight to be given to direct and circumstantial evidence.

During the trial I will sometimes need to talk privately with the lawyers. I may talk with them here at the bench while you are in the courtroom; or I may call a recess and let you leave the room while I talk with the lawyers.

Either way, please understand that while you're waiting, we're working. We have these conferences to make sure that the trial is proceeding according to the law and to avoid confusion or mistakes. We will do what we can to limit the number of these conferences and to keep them as short as possible.

At the end of the trial you will have to make your decision based on what you recall of the evidence. You will not have a written copy of the testimony to refer to. Because of this, you have to pay close attention to the testimony and other evidence as it is presented here in the courtroom.

If you wish, however, you may take notes to help you

remember what witnesses say. If you do take notes, do not show them to anyone until you and your fellow jurors go to the jury room to decide the case after you have heard and seen all of the evidence. And do not let taking notes distract you from paying close attention to the evidence as it is presented.

The clerk will provide each of you with a pad of paper and a pen or pencil. At each recess, leave them in the jury room. When you leave at night, your notes will be locked up and will not be read by anyone.

To make sure this trial is fair to all parties, you must follow these rules:

First, do not talk or communicate among yourselves about this case or about anyone involved with it until the end of the case when you go to the jury room to consider your verdict.

Second, do not talk with anyone else about the case or about anyone involved with it until the trial has ended and you have been discharged as jurors.

Third, when you are outside of the courtroom, do not let anyone tell you anything about this case or about anyone involved with it until the trial has ended and your verdict has been accepted by me. If someone tries to talk to you about this case during the trial, please report it to my courtroom deputy.

Fourth, during the trial, do not talk with or speak to any of the parties, lawyers, or witnesses in this case, not even to pass the time of day. It is important not only that you do justice in this case, but also that you act accordingly. If a person from one side of the lawsuit sees you talking to a person from the other side, even if it is just about the weather, that might raise a suspicion about your fairness.

So when the lawyers, parties, and witnesses do not speak to you in the halls or on the elevator or the like, you understand they are not being rude. They know they are not supposed to talk to you while the trial is going on, and they are just following the rules.

Fifth, you may need to tell your family, close friends, and other people that you are part of this trial. You can tell them when you have to be in court, and you can warn them not to ask you about this case, tell you anything they know or think they know about the case, or talk about this case in front of you.

But you must not communicate with anyone or post information about the parties, witnesses, participants, claims, evidence, or anything else related to this case. You must not tell anyone anything about the jury's deliberations in this case until after I accept your verdict or until I give you specific permission to do so.

If you talk about the case with someone besides the other jurors during deliberations, it looks as if you might already have reached a decision or that you might be influenced in your verdict by their opinions. That would not be fair to the parties, and it might result in the verdict being thrown out and the case having to be tried over again.

During the trial, while you are in the courthouse, and after you leave for the day, do not give any information to anyone by any means about this case. For example, do not talk face to face, use any electronic devices such as a telephone, cell phone, smart phone, BlackBerry, PDA, computer or computer-like device. Likewise, do not use the Internet or any Internet service, do not text or send instant messages, do not go on an Internet chat room, blog, or other Web site such as Facebook, My Space, YouTube or Twitter. In other words, do not communicate with anyone about the case except for the other jurors during deliberations until I accept your verdict.

Sixth, do not do any research on the Internet, in libraries, newspapers, or otherwise, and do not investigate this case on your own. Do not visit or view any place discussed in this case and do not use the Internet or other means to search for or view any place discussed in the testimony. Also do not look up any information about the case, the law, or the people involved, including the parties, the witnesses, the lawyers or me.

Seventh, do not read any news stories or Internet articles or blogs about the case or anyone involved with it, do not listen to any radio or television reports about the case or anyone involved with it. Until the trial is over you may want to avoid reading newspapers and let them accumulate until the trial is finished.

The parties have a right to have you decide their case based only on evidence admitted here in court. If you research, investigate, or experiment on your own, or get information from other sources, your verdict might be influenced by inaccurate, incomplete, or misleading information. Witnesses in court take an oath to tell the truth and the accuracy of their testimony is tested through cross-examination.

All of the parties are entitled to a fair trial and an impartial jury, and you have to conduct yourselves in a way that assures the integrity of the trial process. If you decide a case based on information not admitted in court, you will deny the parties a fair trial. You will deny them justice. You have taken an oath to follow the rules and you must do so. If you do not, the case may have to be retried or you could be held in contempt of court and possibly punished.

Eighth, do not make up your mind during the trial about what your verdict should be. Keep an open mind until after you and your fellow jurors have discussed all the evidence.

The trial will proceed in the following manner: First, the plaintiff's lawyer may make an opening statement. Next, the defendant's lawyer may make an opening statement. An opening statement is not evidence but is a summary of the evidence the lawyers expect you will see and hear during the trial.

After opening statements, the plaintiff will then present evidence. Counsel for the defendant will have the chance to cross-examine the plaintiff's witnesses. After the plaintiff has finished presenting his case, the defendant may present evidence and plaintiff's counsel will have a chance to cross-examine the defendant's witnesses.

After you've seen and heard all the evidence from all sides, the attorneys will make closing arguments that summarize and interpret the evidence. Just as with opening statements, closing arguments are not evidence.

After the closing arguments I will instruct you further on the law. And you will go to the jury room to deliberate and decide your verdict.

When we take a recess, you'll be shown to the jury room which is open for your use. At the end of each recess during the day, please return and assemble in the jury room. The courtroom deputy will come for you when court is ready to resume. No one may enter the jury room other than jurors and court employees.

If you need to communicate with me during trial, please do so only in writing by preparing a note that is signed and dated by you or by calling my chambers -- and we'll give you the phone number for the chambers when you return on Thursday. And a court employee can pick up the note from you.

Now, you have gone through the voir dire process as well as our orientation downstairs. You have heard the preliminary instructions.

And now you are going to be taking a break before we actually proceed with the opening statements and the evidence in this case.

As I told you downstairs, we will do that starting on Thursday morning at nine o'clock. So, you will all need to gather in the jury assembly room before nine o'clock on Thursday so we can start promptly at 9:00 on Thursday. And we will be continuing on Thursday and Friday, and then starting again next Tuesday morning.

And is there anything that I need to discuss with counsel before I excuse the jury for the day?

MS. VARGAS: No, your Honor.

MR. MOORE: Nothing for the defendant, your Honor.

THE COURT: Very good. Thank you very much for your time and attention this morning. Enjoy the rest of your day. You have the day off from court tomorrow. And I will see you again at 9:00 in the morning on Thursday. Thank you.

1 We're in recess. 2 (Jury out at 11:38 a.m.) 3 THE COURT: Now, anything we need to discuss outside the presence of the jury before I begin preparing for my 4 5 hearing tomorrow? MS. VARGAS: Your Honor, if I could, I quess, make a 6 7 motion to preclude the defense counsel from discussing the details of his disability during the course of this trial. 8 This trial is not about him. And any efforts to discuss the circumstances relating to his own disability would prejudice 10 the jury or would be an improper attempt to seek sympathy from 11 them or change their views of the case. I would suggest I 12 13 won't discuss my personal business, that Mr. Moore not discuss 14 his personal business. 15 THE COURT: It's apparent to the jury that Mr. Moore 16 is in a wheelchair. And I don't think there was anything that Mr. Moore said that would be likely to prejudice the jury. 17 18 But Mr. Moore, I doubt there's going to be any need for you to make further references to your history. 19 20 MR. MOORE: I mean, I don't think so. Lawyers are 21 allowed to -- I mean, I am who I am, you know, if -- yeah, I would never use that to try to influence the jury, let's put 22 23 it that way. But, there was -- I guess it's a reference to a person 24 25 who is a quadriplegic, and I was just mentioning my

disability. I don't intend to use it in any manner, but I can't promise the Court I'll never say anything about me through the trial.

So -- but, yeah, I certainly never intended to and would never use it to try to influence the jury.

THE COURT: The comments made during voir dire frankly were not out of the ordinary from what I've heard other lawyers mention during voir dire. Sometimes they do tell the jury a little bit about themselves.

But that's probably going to be unnecessary from this point forward, so I will grant your motion.

Anything further?

MS. VARGAS: Thank you.

One further question, it's more housekeeping. What time will court be concluding each day? If we have a witness who finishes at four o'clock, should we plan to bring somebody right on, or how would you like to handle those kinds of concerns?

THE COURT: Obviously I want to make the best use of the Court's time and the jury's time and everyone's time.

Don't ever feel that you need to stretch a witness to fill up time because you don't have a witness ready to come in for the rest of the day.

I have seen lawyers do that when judges have said, well, unless you have the next witness ready, you're out of here.

We don't do that.

So I would just ask for the lawyers to cooperate with each other and to get their witnesses lined up in such a manner that it uses the jury's time to the best benefit.

I had told the jury that our usual day will be starting at nine o'clock in the morning, take a mid-morning break probably around 10:30, 15-minute break; they'll always get an hour for lunch; now and then, they get longer because sometimes my staff schedules in a one o'clock hearing on the schedule. We'll have a mid-afternoon break, and we will plan to stop promptly at five o'clock each afternoon.

We do that out of a courtesy to the jury and to staff; also because our courthouse security tends to leave -- well, they do leave at 5:30. And the parking garages also close down not long after that.

So I don't want to go past five o'clock. Certainly if you have somebody on the stand and it takes five minutes to wrap it up, we may wrap it up. If your testimony ends at 4, I'd like to use that next hour. I would like to keep the case moving along, but that's about as much guidance as I can give you.

MS. VARGAS: The one situation I'd like to just bring to the Court's attention is that a hostile witness for plaintiff, one of the defendant's former employees, is not available until Tuesday. And so while we think that will fall

1 perfectly with the timing of the case, should we reach a point 2 Friday afternoon where we're ready to move on to him and he's 3 not available, we might ask the Court if we could end a few minutes early out of deference to the fact that he's not 5 available. THE COURT: I'm a little confused about who this 6 7 person is hostile to -- he's hostile to the plaintiff or hostile to Creighton? 8 MS. VARGAS: Hostile to plaintiff. Dr. Hansen was an 9 employee of Creighton University. I understand recently he's 10 no longer employed by Creighton, but I understand from 11 communication with Mr. Moore he's not available until Tuesday. 12 13 And while I think that that's not going to be a problem, if we reach a point where we've gone through all of our 14 15 witnesses except for Dr. Hansen, then he's not going to be 16 available Friday. 17 THE COURT: So he is likely to be your last witness. 18 You are telling me you think you will have your case in Thursday and Friday but for Dr. Hansen. 19 20 MS. VARGAS: We think we're likely to have one or two 21 witnesses on Tuesday and rest on Tuesday. 22 THE COURT: And Dr. Hansen will be one of those. 23 MS. VARGAS: Yes. THE COURT: Thank you for letting me know that. 24 25 Anything further?

```
MR. MOORE: Nothing from the defendant.
 1
 2
                 THE COURT: Very good. Thank you.
 3
            We'll see you on Thursday morning.
 4
            (Adjourned at 11:44 a.m.)
 5
 6
 7
 8
             I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from
       the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.
 9
10
          /s Brenda L. Fauber
Brenda L. Fauber, RDR, CRR
11
                                                    7-21-14
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```